

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-9 are canceled. Claims 10-42 remain pending in the present application.

The specification's use of the term "logical unit number (LUN)" has been made more uniform in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions as shown by the amendments to the specification in this document. Note that the first characterization of "LUN" that is objected to by the Office Action (as the term is used at page 3, line 23 of the application) is not a definition of "LUN" in the present application. The statement at page 3, line 23 of the application refers to a "LUN" in U.S. Patent No. 6,526,478. "This patent provides an improvement in performance by providing a method for dividing a logical unit number (LUN) into a plurality of segments or stripes that are distributed across various drives under the RAID controller." Definitions used in the '678 patent need not apply to those used in the present application. Thus, there should not be any mistaking the definition of "LUN" in other patents with definitions of "LUN" in the present application, even if those definitions in other patents are considered in the present application.

The 35 U.S.C. Section 112, first paragraph, rejection is respectively traversed by this Amendment. The claims are no longer directed to inventions that require a determination of an optimized data organization configuration.

Claims 10, 25, 36, 41 and 42 are the remaining independent claims in the present application. Each of these remaining independent claims includes a limitation not disclosed by nor made obvious in view of the prior art. For example, the present claims include "writing the data in a power managed organizational scheme" if a condition is met and "writing the data in a non-power managed organizational scheme if the condition is not met" (Claim 10). Claim 25 uses a specific condition of "if a volume of data to be written is greater than a threshold volume." Claims 36, 41 and 42 compare an amount of data that is the subject of a "write request" to determine whether to write the data in a "power managed organization scheme" or in a "non-power managed organization scheme."

The prior art does not discuss power managed vs. non-power managed configurations. Idleman's only mention of power considerations is at col. 35, line 34 where data loss due to a power failure is considered.

Dumphy at col. 9, lines 47-54 states that a controller can power down a disk drive but there is no purpose presented for powering a drive up or down other than for maintenance. None of the prior art references discuss using a condition based on "workload

parameters” and/or “data storage system parameters” to determine if a condition is met and then “writing the data in a power managed organizational scheme” or in a “non-power managed organizational scheme” according to the condition.

The dependent claims add numerous other limitations such as specific types of parameters that can be used in the condition or decision as to whether the condition is met.

Applicant respectfully submits that the present claims are in condition for allowance and an early Notice of Allowance is earnestly sought. The undersigned may be contacted at the telephone number below at the Examiner’s convenience if it would help in the prosecution of this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

TRELLIS INTELLECTUAL
PROPERTY LAW GROUP, PC

By 
Charles J. Kulas
Reg. No. 35, 800
Tel.: 650-842-0300